



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/696,867

10/30/2003

Conor Morrison

M1103.70436US00

8068

45840

7590

12/22/2009

WOLF GREENFIELD (Microsoft Corporation)  
C/O WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.  
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE  
BOSTON, MA 02210-2206

EXAMINER

PESIN, BORIS M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/22/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/696,867	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MORRISON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> BORIS PESIN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-23 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-23 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                            |                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                        | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 10/06/2009.

Claims 1-11, 13-23 and 26 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 15, and 26 are independent claims. In the amendment filed 10/06/2009 Claims 1, 15, 21 and 26 were amended. This action is made Non-Final

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ezekiel ("Ezekiel"; US #5625783) in view of Sheard et al. (6,208,345).

As per independent claim 1, Ezekiel teaches a computer-implemented method of generating a componentized user interface for one or more computer applications, at

Art Unit: 2174

least one of which is capable of performing one or more functions, the method comprising:

displaying a first set of interface elements provided by a framework (col 9, paragraph 4 where common commands included as placeholders is interpreted as a set of interface elements);

displaying a second set of interface elements provided by a first plug-in that is linked to the framework (abstract, add-on software components provides additional menu items is interpreted as one or more sets of interface elements) with a first plug-in that is linked to the framework (in fig 2, item 271 where add-on dll is interpreted as a plug-in);

displaying a third set of interface elements provided by a second plug-in that is linked to the framework ( abstract and column 6 paragraph 2 add-on software components provides additional menu items is interpreted as one or more sets of interface elements) with a second plug-in that is linked to the framework (in fig 2, item 272 where add-on dll is interpreted as a plug-in).

Although Ezekiel shows providing an interface between one or more computer applications and the first and second plug-ins(fig 2 link between 260 and 271, 272). Ezekiel does not expressly disclose an interface provided in order to utilize the second set of interface elements and the third set of interface elements; the interface comprising: a first application specific adapter that maps interface elements of the first plug-in to functions of the one or more computer applications; a second application specific adapter that maps interface elements of the second plug-in to functions of the

Art Unit: 2174

one or more computer applications; and a shell adapter that interfaces between the framework and the first and second application specific adapters; and in response to a user activating an interface element provided by the first plug-in, causing a computer application of the one or more computer applications to perform functions, wherein the first application specific adapter maps the interface element to the function.

However, Sheard does teach an interface provided in order to utilize the second set of interface elements and the third set of interface elements; the interface comprising: a first application specific adapter that maps interface elements of the first plug-in to functions of the one or more computer applications; a second application specific adapter that maps interface elements of the second plug-in to functions of the one or more computer applications; and a shell adapter that interfaces between the framework and the first and second application specific adapters; and in response to a user activating an interface element provided by the first plug-in, causing a computer application of the one or more computer applications to perform functions, wherein the first application specific adapter maps the interface element to the function (See Figure 3, which illustrates that each application has its own adapter which maps data to the screen, furthermore Column 20, Lines 45-58 teaches the use of plug ins). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Ezekiel with the teachings of Sheard and include application specific adapters with the motivation to provide the user with an easy method of adopting older software to newer systems.

Claim 26 is similar in scope to claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 2-5, 8-11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ezekiel and Sheard as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of "Defining menus and toolbars in XML" ("Gehrman", Aug 2, 2002).

As per claim 2, Ezekiel and Sheard teach the computer-implemented method of claim 1, wherein the first plug-in comprises:

(i) a first file that provides an interface between the framework and the first plug-in; and (ii) a second file ( Ezekiel, col 6 paragraph 2 where the add-on is interpreted as the plug-in, the module commands object is interpreted as the interface file and the module object is interpreted as the second file).

Ezekiel does not teach that this file is written in a markup language that includes menu elements. However, Gehrman does teach this (Introduction, paragraph 2 where the XML file is interpreted as the file written in a markup language and items appearing in the menu bar may come from many different plug-ins or parts is interpreted as the XML file includes menu elements.)

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Gehrman's XML in Ezekiel's method. The motivation is to facilitate customization of menus without changing the application's source code (Gehrman, introduction).

As per claim 3, although Ezekiel does teach the plug-in contains menu items (Ezekiel, abstract) Gehrman further teaches these items are included in the XML file. (Gehrman Introduction, paragraph 2 where appearance in menu bars and tool bars coded in XML is interpreted to mean the elements in the XML file includes menu bars and toolbars).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Gehrman's inclusion of menu bars and tool bars with Ezekiel's method. The motivation is to facilitate customization of menus including menu bars and tool bars without changing the application's source code (Gehrman, introduction).

As per claim 4, Ezekiel and Sheard teach the computer-implemented method of claim 1, wherein the second plug-in comprises:

(i) a first file that provides an interface between the framework and the second plug-in; and (ii) a second file (Ezekiel, col 6 paragraph 2 where the add-on is interpreted as the plug-in, the module commands object is interpreted as the interface file and the module object is interpreted as the second file).

Ezekiel does not teach that this file is written in a markup language that includes menu elements. However, Gehrman does teach this (paragraph 2 where the XML file is interpreted as the file written in a markup language and items appearing in the menu

Art Unit: 2174

bar may come from many different plug-ins or parts is interpreted as the XML file includes menu elements.)

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Gehrman's XML file in combination with Ezekiel's method. The motivation is to facilitate customization of menus without changing the application's source code (Gehrman, introduction).

As per claim 5, although Ezekiel does teach the plug-in contains menu items (Ezekiel, abstract). Gehrman further teaches these items are included in the XML file. (Gehrman, Introduction, paragraph 2 where appearance in menu bars and tool bars coded in XML is interpreted to mean the elements in the XML file include menu bars and tool bars).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Gehrman's inclusion of menu bars and toolbars with Ezekiel's method. The motivation is to facilitate customization of menus including menu bars and toolbars without changing the application's source code (Gehrman, introduction).

As per claim 8, Ezekiel and Sheard teach the computer-implemented method of claim 2, wherein the first file comprises an executable file (Ezekiel, col 6 paragraph 2 where the add-on is interpreted as the plug-in, the module commands object is interpreted as the interface file and the module object is interpreted as the second file). Ezekiel does not teach the first file is an executable and the second file comprises information written in an extensible markup language (XML).



However, Gehrman does teach this (Introduction, paragraph 2 where the actions coded in C++ is interpreted as an executable and the XML file is interpreted as the file written in an extensible markup language (XML)).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Gehrman's separation of XML file with an executable in combination with Ezekiel's method. The motivation is to facilitate customization of menus without changing the application's source code (Gehrman, introduction).

As per claim 9, Ezekiel and Sheard teach the computer-implemented method of claim 2, wherein the first file comprises an executable file (Ezekiel, col 6 paragraph 2 where the add-on is interpreted as the plug-in, the module commands object is interpreted as the interface file and the module object is interpreted as the second file). Ezekiel does not teach the first file is an executable and the second file comprises information written in a standard generalized markup language (SGML). However, Gehrman does teach this (Introduction, paragraph 2 where the actions coded in C++ is interpreted as an executable and the XML file is interpreted as the file written in a standard generalized markup language (SGML)).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Gehrman's separation of XML file with an executable in combination with Ezekiel's method. The motivation is to facilitate customization of menus without changing the application's source code (Gehrman, introduction).

As per claim 10, Ezekiel and Sheard teach the computer-implemented method of claim 4, wherein the first file comprises an executable file (Ezekiel, col 6 paragraph 2 where the add-on is interpreted as the plug-in, the module commands object is interpreted as the interface file and the module object is interpreted as the second file). Ezekiel does not teach the first file is an executable and the second file comprises information written in an extensible markup language (XML). However, Gehrman does teach this (Introduction, paragraph 2 where the actions coded in C++ is interpreted as an executable and the XML file is interpreted as the file written in an extensible markup language (XML)).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Gehrman's separation of XML file with an executable in combination with Ezekiel's method. The motivation is to facilitate customization of menus without changing the application's source code (Gehrman, introduction).

As per claim 11, Ezekiel and Sheard teach the computer-implemented method of claim 4, wherein the first file comprises an executable file (Ezekiel, col 6 paragraph 2 where the add-on is interpreted as the plug-in, the module commands object is interpreted as the interface file and the module object is interpreted as the second file). Ezekiel does not teach the first file is an executable and the second file comprises a standard generalized markup language (SGML). However, Gehrman does teach this (Introduction, paragraph 2 where the actions coded in C++ is interpreted as an

Art Unit: 2174

executable and the XML file is interpreted as the file written in a standard generalized markup language (SGML)).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Gehrman's separation of XML file with an executable in combination with Ezekiel's method. The motivation is to facilitate customization of menus without changing the application's source code (Gehrman, introduction).

As per claim 13, Ezekiel teaches the computer implemented method of claim 1, wherein the second set and the third set of interface elements comprise interface elements for the same application (Ezekiel, fig 2 items 260, 271, 272).

Claims 6, 7, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ezekiel and Sheard as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of "Microsoft Office 2000/ Visual Basic: Programmer's Guide" ("Shank", April, 1999).

As per claim 6, Ezekiel and Sheard teach the computer-implemented method of claim 1. Ezekiel and Sheard do not teach wherein the framework is configured to discover the first plug-in and the second plug-in. However Shank does teach this (Shank chapter 2, "Deploying Templates and Application-Specific Add-ins" paragraph 3 where the default folder c:\windows\application Data\Microsoft\Addins is interpreted as the default folder the framework is setup to discover plug-ins).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Shank's default folder in Ezekiel's modified method.

Art Unit: 2174

The motivation would have been to make it easier to locate an add-in (Shank, chapter 2, “Deploying Templates and Application-Specific Add-ins” paragraph 7).

As per claim 7, even though Ezekiel shows the application locating and loading the plug-ins(fig 2, 260, 271, 272). He does not explicitly teach this is an automatic loading process. However Shank does teach this (Shank chapter 2, “Deploying Templates and Application-Specific Add-ins” paragraph 3 where add-ins that are installed in the add-ins folder automatically appear in the list of available add-ins dialog box is interpreted to mean the add-ins are automatically loaded from the default configured folder). Since no definition is provided for user interface component loader, it is interpreted in the broadest sense – an automatic loading of a plug-in.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Shank’s component loader in Ezekiel’s modified method. The motivation would have been that the users do not have to browse to find correct files. (Shank, chapter 2, “Deploying Templates and Application-Specific Add-ins” paragraph 5).

As per claim 14, Ezekiel and Sheard teach the computer-implemented method of claim 1 wherein the second set of interface elements comprises interface elements for a first application (Ezekiel abstract and fig 2 items 260, 271). Ezekiel and Sheard do not explicitly teach the third set of interface elements comprise interface elements for a second application that is different from the first application. However Shank does teach this (Chapter 11, Add-ins, Templates, Wizards and Libraries paragraph 3 where COM add-ins work in more than one of the applications).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Shank's non-application specific add-in in Ezekiel's method. The motivation would have been to eliminate redundancy and be able to share code in the add-in (Shank, Chapter 11, Add-ins, Templates, Wizards and Libraries paragraph 3).

Claim 15 is similar to the combination of claims 1 and 6; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ezekiel, Sheard and Shank as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of "Defining menus and toolbars in XML" ("Gehrman", Aug 2, 2002).

As per claim 16, Ezekiel, Sheard and Shank teach the computer-implemented method of claim 15, wherein the plug-in comprises:

(i) a first file that provides an interface between the framework and the plug-in; (ii) a second file that is written in a markup language and that includes menu elements ( Ezekiel, col 6 paragraph 2 where the add-on is interpreted as the plug-in, the module commands object is interpreted as the interface file and the module object is interpreted as the second file). Ezekiel does not teach that this file is written in a markup language that includes menu elements. However, Gehrman does teach this (Introduction, paragraph 2 where the XML file is interpreted as the file written in a markup language and items appearing in the menu bar may come from many different plug-ins or parts is interpreted as the XML file includes menu elements.)

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Gehrman's XML in Ezekiel's method. The motivation is to facilitate customization of menus without changing the application's source code (Gehrman, introduction).

As per claim 17, Ezekiel, Sheard and Shank in view of Gehrman teach the computer-implemented method of claim 16, wherein the menu elements are selected from a group comprising of a toolbar, a status bar, and a menu bar. Although Ezekiel does teach the plug-in contains menu items (Ezekiel, abstract) Gehrman further teaches these items are included in the XML file. (Gehrman Introduction, paragraph 2 where appearance in menu bars and tool bars coded in XML is interpreted to mean the elements in the XML file include menu bars and toolbars).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Gehrman's inclusion of menu bars and toolbars with Ezekiel's method. The motivation is to facilitate customization of menus including menu bars and toolbars without changing the application's source code (Gehrman, introduction).

As per claim 18, Ezekiel, Sheard and Shank and Gehrman teach the computer-implemented method of claim 16, wherein the first file comprises an executable file (Ezekiel, col 6 paragraph 2 where the add-on is interpreted as the plug-in, the module commands object is interpreted as the interface file and the module object is interpreted as the second file). Ezekiel does not teach the first file is an executable and the second file comprises information written in an extensible markup language (XML). However,

Art Unit: 2174

Gehrman does teach this (Introduction, paragraph 2 where the actions coded in C++ is interpreted as an executable and the XML file is interpreted as the file written in an extensible markup language (XML)).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Gehrman's separation of XML file with an executable in combination with Ezekiel's method. The motivation is to facilitate customization of menus without changing the application's source code (Gehrman, introduction).

As per claim 19, Ezekiel, Sheard and Shank and Gehrman teach the computer-implemented method of claim 16, wherein the first file comprises an executable file (Ezekiel, col 6 paragraph 2 where the add-on is interpreted as the plug-in, the module commands object is interpreted as the interface file and the module object is interpreted as the second file). Ezekiel does not teach the first file is an executable and the second file comprises information written in a standard generalized markup language (SGML). However, Gehrman does teach this (Introduction, paragraph 2 where the actions coded in C++ is interpreted as an executable and the XML file is interpreted as the file written in a standard generalized markup language (SGML)).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Gehrman's separation of XML file with an executable in combination with Ezekiel's method. The motivation is to facilitate customization of menus without changing the application's source code (Gehrman, introduction).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 20, Ezekiel, Sheard and Shank and Gehrman teach the computer implemented method of claim 15, wherein the framework is configured to provide the first set of interface elements (col 9, paragraph 4 where *common commands included as placeholders* is interpreted as a set of interface elements); Ezekiel does not teach the set is for a plurality of applications. However Gehrman does teach this (Gehrman page 3, paragraph 2 where standard actions are stored in a non-application specific class.)

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use Gehrman's separation of a set of standard actions, which are non-application specific. The motivation is to have the standard actions automatically be included in the application(s) without having to rewrite code. (Gehrman, page 3 paragraph 2).

As per claim 21, Ezekiel, Sheard and Shank teach the computer-implemented method of claim 15, wherein the method further comprises:

Ezekiel shows loading a second plug-in (Ezekiel fig 2, 260, 271, 272) providing a third set of interface elements ( Ezekiel, abstract). Ezekiel does not explicitly teach the addition of a user interface component loader. However Shank does teach this (Shank chapter 2, "Deploying Templates and Application-Specific Add-ins" paragraph 3 where add-ins interpreted as plug-ins that are installed in the add-ins folder automatically appear in the list of available add-ins dialog box is interpreted to mean the add-ins are automatically loaded from the default configured folder). Since no definition is provided



for user interface component loader it is interpreted in the broadest sense –an automatic loading of an add-in.

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Shank's default folder and component loader in Ezekiel's method. The motivation would have been that users do not have to browse to find correct files(Shank, chapter 2, "Deploying Templates and Application-Specific Add-ins" paragraph 5).

Ezekiel teaches providing an interface between one or more applications and the second plug-in with a second application specific adapter in order to utilize the third set of interface elements. (fig 2 link between 260 and 271, 272). Ezekiel does not expressly disclose the link is a shell adapter interface, in order to utilize the third set of interface elements. However, Ezekiel, Sheard and Shank does teach this (Sheard Figure 3).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Ezekiel, Sheard and Shank adapter in Ezekiel's method. The motivation would have been to increase the components' reusability and ease their integration.

As per claim 22, Ezekiel teaches the computer-implemented method of claim 21, wherein both the second set and the third set of interface elements comprise interface elements for a first application (Ezekiel, fig 2 items 260, 271, 272).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 23, Ezekiel, Sheard and Shank teach the computer-implemented method of claim 21 wherein the second set of interface elements comprises interface elements for a first application (Ezekiel fig2 items 260, 271). Ezekiel does not explicitly teach the third set of interface elements comprise interface elements for a second application that is different from the first application. However Shank does teach this (Chapter 11, Add-ins, Templates, Wizards and Libraries paragraph 3 where COM add-ins work in more than one of the applications).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the Shank's non-application specific add-in in Ezekiel's method. The motivation would have been to eliminate redundancy and be able to share code in the add-in (Shank, Chapter 11, Add-ins, Templates, Wizards and Libraries paragraph 3 where add-in is interpreted as plug-in).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11, 13-23 and 26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Schechter et al. (US 7380250)

***Inquiry***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BORIS PESIN whose telephone number is (571)272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on (571)272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Boris Pesin/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174